



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,569	08/31/2001	Bertrand Berthelot	1807.1743	9399
5514	7590	11/08/2005	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			STEVENS, ROBERT	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2176
DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/942,569	BERTHELOT ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert M. Stevens	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application No. 09/942,569 RCE filed 8/19/2005 to the original application filed 8/31/2001 by Berthelot et al. entitled "Method and Device for Adapting the Content of Documents of an Information Server".
2. The Office withdraws all previous objections/rejections raised, in light of the amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. **Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Tso (US Patent No. 6,959,318, filed Mar. 6, 1998 and issued Oct. 25, 2005, hereafter referred to as "Tso") in view of Dutta et al (US Patent No. US 6,615,212, filed Aug. 19, 1999 and issued Sep. 2, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Dutta").

**Regarding independent method claim 1, Tso discloses:**

*A method of providing content of documents via a network, comprising the steps of:*

*transcoding a first content into a second content according to each of a plurality of characteristics, said transcoding of said first content taking place before a reception of a request for access to said first content; (col. 6 lines 45-65, esp. lines 49-61 discussing actions prior to client request)*

*receiving a request for access to a said first content from a user terminal,  
said access request beginning a communication session; (Abstract, col. 6 lines  
45-65 and col. 9 lines 12-18)*

*... ; and*

*sending said second content corresponding to the derived characteristic to  
said user terminal in response to said access request. (col. 6 lines 45-65, esp.  
lines 54-63)*

Tso, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*... ;*

*... ;*

*... ;*

*deriving a characteristic contained in said access request; and*

*... .*

Dutta, though, discloses:

*... ;*

*... ;*

*... ;*

*deriving a characteristic contained in said access request; (Abstract,  
discussing a determination that a client does not have the necessary processing  
software) and*

*... .*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Dutta for the benefit of Tso, because to do so would have allowed a transcoding system designer to increase processing efficiency, as taught by Dutta in the Abstract and col. 2 lines 33-36. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., transcoding of data.

**Regarding claim 2**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Tso further discloses:

*wherein the transcoding step is interrupted on reception of a request for  
access to the first content. (Abstract and Fig. 3 #25 and #16)*

**Regarding claim 3<sub>1</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Tso further discloses:

*wherein, at the transcoding step, content of all documents situated on an information server is transcoded according to said characteristics.* (col. 6 lines 35-65, esp. lines 45-65 discussing “some or all”)

**Claim 3<sub>2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 3<sub>1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 4<sub>1</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Tso further discloses:

*wherein, at the transcoding step, content of only some documents situated on an information server is transcoded according to said characteristics.* (col. 6 lines 35-65, esp. lines 45-65 discussing “some or all”)

**Claim 4<sub>2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 4<sub>1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 5<sub>1</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously discussed:

Tso, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*further comprising a step of determining an order of processing for the transcoding of content situated on an information server.*

Dutta, though, discloses:

*further comprising a step of determining an order of processing for the transcoding of content situated on an information server.* (Abstract, discussing a determination of whether or not to transcode a first format into second format)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Dutta for the benefit of Tso, because to do so would have allowed a transcoding system designer to increase processing efficiency, as taught by Dutta in the Abstract and col. 2 lines 33-36. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., transcoding of data.

**Claim 5<sub>2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 5<sub>1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 6<sub>5-1</sub>** Tso further discloses:

*wherein, at the determination step, the order of processing of the content is determined according to frequency of access to the content on the information server.* (col. 8 lines 33-55 discussing access probabilities, in context of col. 6 lines 35-67)

**Claim 6<sub>5-2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 6<sub>5-1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 7<sub>6-5-1</sub>**, Tso further discloses:

*wherein only some content having a frequency of access greater than a threshold amount are transcoded.* (col. 8 lines 33-55 discussing access probabilities, in context of col. 6 lines 35-67)

**Claim 7<sub>6-5-2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 7<sub>6-5-1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 8<sub>5-1</sub>** Tso further discloses:

*wherein, at the determination step, the order of processing of the content is determined according to a tree of the content on the information server.* (col. 6 lines 35-65, esp. lines 45-51 discussing HTML document processing, it being well-known in the art that HTML documents are abstracted as tree data structures having the document content represented by the nodes of the tree)

**Claim 8<sub>5-2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 8<sub>5-1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 9<sub>1</sub>**, Tso further discloses:

*wherein, at the deriving step, the characteristic contained in said access request is chosen amongst characteristics of a terminal of said user, characteristics of a communication network between said user and an information server, and characteristics peculiar to the user.* (Abstract and col. 4 lines 36-61)

**Claim 9<sub>2</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 9<sub>1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 10<sub>1</sub>**, Tso further discloses:

*further comprising a step of eliminating said transcoded content at the end of the communication session between said user terminal and an information server.* (col. 10 lines 1-40)

**Claim 10<sub>2</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 2, is substantially similar to claim 10<sub>1</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 11** is directed to a device comprised of the means for implementing the method of claim 1. As such claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 12** is substantially similar to claim 5 (i.e., claims 5<sub>1</sub> and 5<sub>2</sub>), and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claims 13<sub>1</sub> and 13<sub>2</sub>** are substantially similar to claims 10<sub>1</sub> and 10<sub>2</sub>, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 14<sub>11</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been previously discussed.

Tso, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said receiving means, said analyzing means, and said transcoding means are incorporated in:*

*a microprocessor;*  
*a read only memory adapted to store a program for transcoding the content of documents; and*  
*a random access memory comprising: registers transcoded to store variables modified during the running of said program.*

Dutta, though, discloses:

*wherein said receiving means, said deriving means, and said transcoding means are incorporated in:*

*a microprocessor; (Fig. 3 #302)*  
*a read only memory adapted to store a program for transcoding the content of documents; (Fig. 3 #330) and*

*a random access memory comprising: registers transcoded to store variables modified during the running of said program. (Fig. 3 #304)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Dutta for the benefit of Tso, because to do so would have allowed a transcoding system designer to increase processing efficiency, as taught by Dutta in the Abstract and col. 2 lines 33-36. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., transcoding of data.

**Claim 14<sub>12</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 12, is substantially similar to claim 14<sub>11</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 15<sub>1</sub>** is directed to a server comprised of the means for implementing the method of claim 1. As such claim 15<sub>1</sub> is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 15<sub>2</sub>** is directed to a server comprised of the means for implementing the method of claim 2. As such claim 15<sub>2</sub> is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 16<sub>1</sub>** is directed to a communication network comprising at least one server comprised of the means for implementing the method of claim 1. As such claim 16<sub>1</sub> is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 16<sub>2</sub>** is directed to a communication network comprising at least one server comprised of the means for implementing the method of claim 2. As such claim 16<sub>2</sub> is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 17<sub>1</sub>** is directed to a computer program on a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claim 1. As such claim 17<sub>1</sub> is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claim 17<sub>2</sub>** is directed to a computer program on a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claim 2. As such claim 17<sub>2</sub> is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 18<sub>13-11</sub>**, which is dependent upon claim 13<sub>11</sub>, the limitations of claim 13<sub>11</sub> have been previously discussed.

Tso, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said receiving means, said analyzing means, and said transcoding means are incorporated in:*  
*a microprocessor;*  
*a read only memory adapted to store a program for transcoding the content of documents; and*  
*a random access memory comprising: registers transcoded to store variables modified during the running of said program.*

Dutta, though, discloses:

*wherein said receiving means, said deriving means, and said transcoding means are incorporated in:*  
*a microprocessor; (Fig. 3 #302)*

*a read only memory adapted to store a program for transcoding the content of documents; (Fig. 3 #330) and  
a random access memory comprising: registers transcoded to store variables modified during the running of said program. (Fig. 3 #304)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Dutta for the benefit of Tso, because to do so would have allowed a transcoding system designer to increase processing efficiency, as taught by Dutta in the Abstract and col. 2 lines 33-36. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., transcoding of data.

**Claim 18<sub>13-12</sub>** is substantially similar to claim 18<sub>13-11</sub>, and therefore likewise rejected.

#### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/19/2005 (via RCE) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's amendments to the claims significantly changes the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments concerning the previous rejections of claims 1-18 under 35 USC 103(a) have been rendered moot.

#### *Conclusion*

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

***US Patents***

Mighdoll et al	6,311,197
Tso et al	6,421,733
Bellwood et al	6,401,132

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens  
Reg. No. 47,972  
Art Unit 2176  
Date: November 12, 2005

rms

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*11/4/2005*